DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 219 CS 208 997

AUTHOR Towers, Wayne M.; Hartung, Barbara W.
TITLE Magazine Readership and Some Uses and Gratifications: A Replicated Approach.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (68th, Memphis, TN, August 3-6, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; Incentives; *Information Needs; Journalism; Mass Media; *Media Research; Motivation; *Periodicals; *Reading Habits; Reading Interests; *Research Methodology
IDENTIFIERS *Readership Analysis; *Uses and Gratifications Research

ABSTRACT

Since the concepts of surveillance (international information and keeping up with the job that the government is doing), diversion (being entertained and killing time), and interaction (people learning more about themselves) have been developed for newspaper and television but not necessarily for magazines, a study applied 14 uses-and-gratifications statements concerning these concepts in an initial telephone sample of 543 adults in a western urban area and a replicated telephone sample of 557 adults from the same area. Overall, the findings revealed that magazine readership in general was related to the diversion idea of improving the reader's lifestyle and the interaction concept of getting information to pass on to other people. Reading consumer magazines was specifically related to improving lifestyles, while reading newsmagazines put more emphasis on the interaction of understanding what is going on. Finally, magazine nonreaders were more likely to be oriented toward local information, an area rarely, if ever, covered by the magazine medium. (HOD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED258219

# MAGAZINE READERSHIP AND SOME USES AND GRATIFICATIONS: A REPLICATED APPROACH

by

Wayne M. Towers, Ph.D.

Associate Professor
and
Acting Head of Advertising

and

Barbara W. Hartung, Ph.D.

Associate Professor
and
Chair of the Department of Journalism

Department of Journalism
San Diego State University
San Diego, California 92182

Telephone: Office: (619) 265-6301
(619) 265-6635
Home: (619) 265-5468

Paper presented to the Magazine Division, Association for Education in Journalism (AEJMC), Memphis, Tennessee, August 3-6, 1985

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wayne M. Towers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

ABSTRACT

MAGAZINE READERSHIP AND
SOME USES-AND-GRATIFICATIONS:
A REPLICATED APPROACH

Using an initial telephone sample of 543 adults in a Western urban area and a replicated telephone sample of 557 adults from the same area, the study applied fourteen uses-and-gratifications statements concerning surveillance, diversion, and interaction to the medium of magazine. Overall, the study found that magazine readership in general was related to the Diversion idea of improving the reader's lifestyle and the Interaction concept of getting information to pass on to other people. Reading consumer magazines was specifically related to improving lifestyles, while reading newsmagazines put more emphasis on the Interaction of understanding what is going on. Magazine non-readers were more likely to be oriented toward local information, an area rarely, if ever, covered by the magazine medium. The study also demonstrated that orientations toward magazines shared the common concepts of Surveillance, Diversion, and Interaction with newspapers, but that the three dimensions for magazine emphasized different uses-and-gratifications statements for those concepts than did newspaper.

# MAGAZINE READERSHIP AND SOME USES-AND-GRATIFICATIONS: A REPLICATED APPROACH

Since 1962, when Katz and Foulkes defined uses-and-gratifications research as an emphasis on what people did with media rather than on what media did to people,[1] research into the concept of an active audience has shown increasing vogue in the scholarly literature. Much recent research, however, has focused on newspaper,[2] television,[3] or both.[4] Compared to these broad, generalized media, the more targeted media of radio and magazine have received considerably less attention. Since radio and magazine are more fragmented and offer a broader range of selection to their respective audiences, their uses by their audiences provide an inviting opportunity to apply research into the active audiences of targeted media. The purpose of this study is to examine the active audience of magazine readers by using the research perspective of uses-and-gratifications.

Within the uses-and-gratifications literature, three recent studies have included magazine readership in their measurement. In 1982, Houghton-Larsen studied Canadian university students and found that magazines were considered important only for international news information and trailed newspapers, radio, televisions, and phonographs for entertainment and everyday information.[5] In a 1983 study of Southwestern college students, Lichtenstein and Rosenfeld found that the reasons for using magazines were keeping up with the job the government is doing and just for entertainment.[6] Finally, Lichtenstein and Rosenfeld reported on another study of Southwestern undergraduates in 1984 and concluded that the primary reasons for reading magazines were to learn more about themselves and to kill time.[7]

Despite the different phrasings, the statements in all three studies fell into the three broad areas of uses-and-gratifications identified by Blumler in 1979: <u>surveillance</u> of the surrounding environment; <u>diversion</u> from the surrounding environment through entertainment and escape; and, personal identity, a form of <u>interaction</u> with the broader environment that relates how the self is identified and developed in terms of real and imagined involvement in that

environment.[8] Surveillance would include the magazine concepts of international information and keeping up with the job that the government is doing. Diversion would include being entertained and killing time. Finally, the notion of interaction would cover people learning more about themselves.

Since the terminology used in these studies varied widely, and since the concepts of surveillance, diversion, and interaction have been developed for newspaper and television, but not necessarily for magazine, the first hypothesis tested was:

$H_1$: Uses-and-gratifications statements applied to magazine will fall within the three broad categories of surveillance, diversion, and interaction.

Additionally, research in the newspaper medium has indicated that the three broad areas of surveillance, diversion, and interaction have proved useful for discriminating among types of newspaper readership. In a study of weekday and Sunday newspaper readership, Towers applied the three groups of uses-and-gratifications statements and found that (1) subscribers read newspapers through all seven days of the week for the surveillance of getting immediate knowledge of big news events; (2) subscribers also read the Sunday newspaper for the simple diversion of feeling happy; (3) weekday single copy readers emphasized newspapers for the interaction of finding interesting or unusual stories to tell others; (4) Sunday single copy readers favored the surveillance of understanding what is going on and the diversion of just passing the time; and, (5) weekday and Sunday newspaper non-readers simply viewed newspaper as a diversion to pass the time, although they occasionally acquired a newspaper for the interaction of getting more information on things they had seen such as movies, sports events or accidents.[9]

While the findings of newspaper studies would not necessarily be directly applicable to magazine reading, they do provide some helpful guidelines for developing hypotheses for studying magazine readership. In Towers' study, all three groups viewed newspaper as a means of diversion: the subscribers felt the Sunday newspaper contributed to their sense of well being while the single copy readers and the non-readers saw newspapers as a way to pass time. If the diversion

motives apply to media other than newspaper, then in terms of magazines, magazine subscribers would be expected to feel that magazines contribute to their well-being, while single copy readers and non-readers would simply view magazines as a way to past time. To explore this possibility, the study tested the following two hypotheses:

$H_2$: Magazine subscribers will be more strongly related to the diversion concept of magazines helping them be happy than will magazine single copy readers and non-readers.

$H_3$: Magazine single copy readers and non-readers will be more strongly related to the diversion concept of just passing the time with magazines than will magazine subscribers.

Continuing the approach of paralleling newspaper findings with magazine readership, the Towers study also found that newspapers subscribers strongly endorsed the surveillance notion of getting immediate knowledge of big events while single copy readers only weakly endorsed the idea and non-readers simply were not as strongly interested. While the mechanics of magazine production reduce the possibility of daily immediacy, magazine contents are built around weekly and monthly production cycles that are sufficiently immediate for their content areas so that the notion of timely acquisition of information would still apply. In this context, the study examined a fourth hypothesis, but this time related to the context of surveillance.

$H_4$: Magazine subscribers and single copy readers will be more strongly related to the surveillance concept of getting timely knowledge of major events than will magazine non-readers.

Finally, since the concept of interaction also appeared in the Towers study within the contexts of single copy readers acquiring weekday newspapers to find interesting or unusual stories to tell others and non-readers occasionally acquiring Sunday newspapers to follow up on witnessed events, this study also used two interaction hypotheses:

$H_5$: Magazine single copy readers will be more strongly related to the interaction concept of finding interesting or unusual stories to tell others than will magazine subscribers or non-readers.

$H_6$: Magazine non-readers will be more strongly related to the interaction concept of getting more information on things they have witnessed than will magazine subscribers and single copy readers.

Note that if all the hypotheses hold, then motivations for magazine readership will exactly parallel newsaper readership, and the resulting insights will apply to print in general and not to magazine and newspaper separately. If the hypotheses do not hold or if different variables apply to the concepts of surveillance, diversion, and interaction, then magazine and newspaper will require separate sets of explanations for their readership orientations.

Method

Because direct application of uses-and-gratifications statements to magazine was a relatively untried effort, great care was taken to insure the strength of the measurements involved. During Fall 1981, a telephone survey of 543 adults was conducted using random digit dialing (RDD) in a large urban area of the Western United States (Sample I). Interviews were conducted by trained undergraduates in a research methods class, then each completed interview was verified by a second telephone call from undergraduates in a different class. Additionally, planted numbers were assigned to both groups to verify tha they were using the assigned telephone numbers and accurately attempting the calls. This initial sample was then replicated during Spring 1982 with different random sample of 557 adults from the same geographic are (Sample II). The second sample followed the same basic approach as Sample I with the only differences being that a new set of RDD numbers was used and different groups of undergraduates conducted the interviews and the verifications. This second sample was used to set up a full replication of the application of uses-and-gratifications statements to the magazine medium.

Both samples were administered questionnaires with identical questions but different orders of presentation. Questions were asked concerning demographics, media usage, and reactions to a selection of uses and gratifications statements. Because the study's hypotheses were derived through parallelling magazine readership with the findings in Towers' study, that study's fourteen uses-and-gratifications statements for newspaper were applied to the magazine medium. According to that study, the four statements reflecting surveillance were "Get immediate knowledge of big news events;" "Keep me informed about what is happening in my local community;" "Find issues affecting people like myself;" and, "Understand what is going on." Another group of six statements reflected diversion: "Just pass the time;" "Be entertained;" "Be happy;" "Improve the quality of my lifestyle;" "Get exciting, dramatic and entertaining news;" and, "By being my friend when I am alone." Finally, four additional statements were used for interaction: "Find interesting or unusual stories that I can tell to others;" "Get information to pass on to other people;" "Get more information on things I've seen such as movies, sports events or accidents;" and, "Find products through advertisements."[10] Again, if this study of magazines produced identical results, then the insights would apply to all print. If different results emerged, then newspaper and magazine would require consideration as distinctive media.

After verification, the completed questionnaires were coded, keypunched, and analyzed using version 8.3 of SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Replies to the fourteen uses and gratifications statements were coded from one for strongly disagree through five for strongly agree for a five point range of replies: (1) strongly disagree; (2) disagree; (3) neutral-no opinion; (4) agree; (5) strongly agree. This coding permitted the replies to be treated as approximately interval data for subsequent analysis.

Results

Analysis of the data needed to accomplish two goals: first, establishing that the fourteen uses-and-gratifcations statements would produce the hypothesized three dimensions of surveillance, diversion, and interaction when they were applied to magazine. The second goal was

to use theose statements to examine the magazine behaviors of subscribing, single copy reading, and not reading to determine if the statements were effective predictors of those behaviors.

First goal. To accomplish the first goal and to test the study's first hypothesis of the applicability of the three dimensions of surveillance, diversion, and interaction to magazine, the statistical technique of factor analysis was used to determine if the fourteen statements would produce the expected dimensions of surveillance, diversion, and interaction. Table 1 shows the solution of a principal components, varimax orthogonal rotation factor analysis.

Table 1

Table 1 shows that the study produced the hypothesized three groupings but with differences in terms of the variables taken from the Towers study. To aid interpretation, each of the fourteen statements has been labelled with its factor from the Towers study in parentheses after the statement.

The first factor contained the interaction statements "Get information to pass on to other people" and "Find interesting or unusual stories that I can tell to others;" as well as the surveillance statements "Understand what is going on" and "Find issues affecting people like myself." The third factor contained the surveillance statements "Get immediate knowledge of big news events" and "Keep me informed about what is happening in my local community;" as well the diversion statement "Get exciting, dramatic and entertaining news" and the interaction statement "Get information on things I've seen such as movies, sports events or accidents." These two sets of different factor groupings meant that magazines were clearly different from newspaper in terms of the relations among variables that made up their factor structure. Because the two variables loading most strongly on Factor I were interaction statements, that factor was named Interaction for magazines. Since two surveillance variables produced the strongest loadings on Factor III that factor was named Surveillance.

The second factor in Table 1 was clearly a Diversion factor, incorporating "Be happy;" "Be entertained;" "Just pass the time;" "Improve the quality of my lifestyle;" and "By being my friend when I am

alone." The only stray statement was the interaction statement "Find products through advertising," but it loaded more weakly on the factor than four of the five diversion statements. Since magazine statements emerged as different from newspaper statements, subsequent mentions of the uses-and-gratifications factors will use the groupings from Table 1 rather than from the literature.

Since the same fourteen statements also had been used in Sample II, the study was able to replicate the initial factor analysis using a different set of respondents. Additionally, because the initial factor analysis in Table 1 produced empirical estimates of the communalities between the individual variables and the resulting factors, the more powerful technique of principal factors could be used to derive the factor structures. In the principal components approach to factor analysis used in Table 1, the initial step is to calcualte a correlation matrix with unities (ones) in the matrix's main diagonals since each variable correlates perfectly with itself. From a factor analysis perspective, however, these unities mean that each variable is completely independent from the other variables. For a single sample study such an assumption would be reasonable because mathematical interrelations among verbally independent variables would not be known. However, since the fourteen statments produced three factors rather than fourteen for Sample I respondents, the statements proved to be highly interrelated mathematically. In factor analysis, allowances can be made for such interrelatedness by replacing the unities in the main diagonal of the correlation matrix with estimates of the expected communalities between each variable and the expected factors. This replacement technique is called Principal Factors and yields a mathemamtically more powerful solution than when unities are used in the correlation matrix's main diagonal.[11] For this study, the calculated communalities that resulted from the initial factor analysis in Table 1 were used in the main diagonal of the correlation matrix for calculating Table 2.

Table 2

Table 2 shows the solution of a principal factors, varimax orthogonal rotation factor analysis in which the unities have been replaced with empirical estimates of the communalites between each

variable and the expected factors. As with Table 1, the three factors of surveillance, diversion, and interaction emerged in Table 2. Each of Table 1's three factors was replicated in terms of the statements that loaded on them. Each variable's Table 1 loading has been placed in parentheses after each statement to underline this replication. Although the strength of the loadings differed somewhat, both factor solutions grouped the same variables on the same factors. This repetition indicated that the tripartite factors of Surveillance, Interaction and Diversion were consistent for the magazine across similar independent samples.

In terms of Hypothesis 1's assertion of the three dimensions of surveillance, diversion, and interaction, the hypothesized dimensions did emerge but with variation in terms of whcih statements loaded on which factors. Consequently, Hypothesis 1 was accepted, but with the insight that orientations toward magazine are different from newspaper orientations and that similar statements take on different conceptual meanings when applied to different media.

Second goal. The study's second goal was to determine if the uses-and-gratifications statements could be used to describe magazine-related behaviors like subscribing, single copy reading and non-reading. Since the fourteen statements had replies ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, these replies were coded from five for strong agreement down to one for strong disagreement, and treated as interval data. But since subscribing, single copy reading and non-reading were basically nominal, the magazine variables could not be treated as interval data. The resulting combination of interval replies to the uses-and-gratifications statements with nominal replies to magazine behaviors made discriminant analysis the appropriate statistical technique for examining interrelations, with the fourteen statements treated as the independent variables used to predict the nominal dependent variables of magazine readership behaviors.[12]

Table 3

Table 3 provides a summary of the discriminant equations that resulted from the respondents in Sample I when the fourteen uses-and-gratifications statements were applied to each of three

magazine behaviors: reading any magazines; reading news magazines; and reading consumer magazines. The first behavior was used to examine magazine as a medium. The second two behaviors were used as a precaution in case reading newsmagazines like Time, Newsweek, and U.S. News and World Report involved different orientations than reading popular consumer magazines ranging from Popular Mechanics to Playgirl. All three solutions were statistically significant at the 0.10 level or less, and each solution correctly classfied more respondents than could be expected by the prior probability of simple chance.

The main purpose of these initial discriminant analyses was to mathematically select the statistically most predictive variables. This approach reduced the number of variables needed for subsequent analyses and provided broad, descriptive insights into the interrelations among the independent and dependent variables. In terms of reading all magaziness, Table 3 shows in the first column that persons who reported reading magazines during the past month (-0.16) were related to "Understand whatis going on" (-0.45) as the strongest predictor variable, followed by "Get information to pass on to other people" (-0.42); "Be entertained" (-0.40); "Improve the quality of my lifestyle" (-0.29); and, "Find issues affecting people like myself" (-0.18). Since the first two statements came from the Interaction group, the third and fourth from the Diversion group, and the fifth from the Surveillance group, all three uses-and-gratifcations concepts applied to the magazine medium, with Interaction as the strongest explanation, follwed in order by Diversion and Surveillance. On the other hand, persons who had not read magazines during the past month were more strongly related to substitute companionship [+0.38] and interest in news of localized events [+0.34].

For subscribers (-0.44) and readers (-0.77) of newsmagazines, Table 3's second column shows that they were related to the Interaction statements of "Get more information on things I've seen such as movies, sports events or accidents" (-0.49); "Get information to pass on to other people" (-0.35); and, "Understand what is going on" (-0.23). The table also shows that these users of newsmagazines were related to the Surveillance statements of "Get immediate knowledge of big news events"

(-0.36); and, "Get exciting, daramatic and entertaining news" (-0.33). This mixture of Surveillance and Interaction indicated that both concepts were important for newsmagazine readership. On the other hand, newsmagazine non-readers [+0.20] were more closely related to keeping informed about their local community [+0.56]; reading advertisements [+0.43]; and, substitute companionship [+0.40]. These findings indicated that newsmagazine non-readers were more strongly related to orientations that such magazines typically do not serve.

Finally, Table 3's third column indicates that consumer magazine subscribers (+0.28) and single copy readers (+0.11) in Sample I were oriented toward the Diversion statements of "Improve the quality of my lifestyle" (+0.35); "Be happy" (+0.26); "Find products through advertisements" (+0.25); and "Just pass the time" (+0.19). Additionally, users of consumer magazines were related to the Surveillance statement of "Find issues affecting people like myself" (+0.33); and, the Interaction statements of "Understand what is going on" (+0.34); and, "Get information to pass on to other people" (+0.28). This embarassment of riches indicated that both Diversion and Interaction as well as a touch of Surveillance were all important to consumer magazine readership. Alternatively, consumer magazine non-readers [-0.47] were more oriented to the Surveillance statements of keeping informed about their community [-0.33]; getting immediate knowledge of big news events [-0.27]; and, getting exciting, dramatic and entertaining news [-0.24]. Additionally, the non-readers also were oriented toward the Interaction notion of getting more information on things they have seen [-0.26]; and, the Diversion notion of substitute companionship [-0.10]. Overall, these findings indicated that consumer magazine readership tended more toward Interaction and Diversion, while non-readership tended toward Surveillance statements that were not particularly appropriate for consumer magazines.

Overall, the results summarized in Table 3 point toward the helpfulness of uses-and-gratifications statements in reflecting explanatory orientations toward the magazine medium. Since the results in Table 3 are based only on a single sample, they are more descriptive than inferential. To test the inferential capabilities of these

statements, the discriminant analyses were repeated using the respondents in Sample II. As with the factor analyses discussed in the section on the first goal, discriminant analyses can be improved by using prior knowledge of the variables involved. For this study, the variables identified as predictive by the equations presented in Table 3 were re-examined using the respondents of Sample II. Unlike the descriptive explanations related to Sample I, the resulting Sample II explanations can be regarded as predictive, and will be examined in greater detail.

Table 4

Table 4 shows the discriminant analysis that resulted when the selected statements from Table 3 were applied to Sample II in terms of overall magazine readership. The first column of Table 4 shows the four statements that remained statistically significant after the discriminant analysis. The relative strength of those variables is shown by canonical correlation loadings which are shown in parentheses down the columns for each statment and across the rows for read and did not read. These loadings were used because they are easier to interpret than the centroids and unstandardized weights of discriminant analysis; like Pearson correlation coefficients, canonical corelations range more-or-less from plus to minus one, with zero as a midpoint.[13] The positive canonical loading for reading magazines (+0.08) indicates that this variable was related to the Diversion statement of "Improve the quality of my lifestyle" (+0.52); and, the Interaction statements of "Find issues affecting people like myself" (+0.46); and, "Get information to pass on to other people" (+0.37). Conversely, the negative loading for magazine non-readership (-0.48) indicated that they were related to the Surveillance statement of keeping informed about the local community (-0.66).

Because discriminant analyses are often difficult to interpret intuitively, the mean replies to the uses-and-gratifications for each readership group are presented in each group's respective columns. The group means for "Improve the quality of my lifestyle" indicate that magazine readership (3.55) had a higher mean (higher level of agreement) than magazine non-readership (3.07). This higher mean implied that

readers of any magazines had stronger orientations toward deriving diversion and interaction from magazines than did non-readers; and, that non-readers did not use magazines because the magazines did not fulfill this latter group's Surveillance needs.

The strength of this explanation is presented in the lower part of Table 4. The solution was statisitically significant at the 0.01 level and predictive classification was greatly improved. Although the descriptive solution of Table 3 improved classification from 50.0% by pure chance to 71.4%, the inferential solution presented in Table 4 increased the accuracy of classification to 86.2%, a much higher level possible than by chance alone. Although such a level of prediction is far from a perfect 100%, it is a sufficiently large measure of increase over chance to argue for the approach's usefulness and to point out that the variables are powerful but less than perfect.

Table 5

Table 5 repeats the analysis of Table 4, but narrows the focus to newsmagazine readership. Newsmagazine subscribers (+0.39) and single copy readers (+0.26) were related to the Interaction statement of "Understand what is going on" (+1.07) and the Surveillance statement of "Get more information on things I have seen such as movies, sports events or accidents" (+0.24). On the other hand, newsmagazine non-readers (-0.11) were related to the Diversion statement of finding products through advertising (-0.90); and, the interaction of getting information to pass on to others (-0.37). Examination of the means supported this analysis, with the means for subscribers (3.83) and single copy readers (3.67) higher than the non-readers for "Understand what is going on." The strength of differences weakened somewhat for "Get more information on things I've seen such as movies, sports events or accidents," with subscribers (3.50) producing a higher mean than non-subscribers (3.24), but with single copy readers (3.09) falling below the non-readers. These findings meant that both subscribers and single copy readers used newsmagazines for the interaction of understanding what is going on, but that subscribers added a stronger interest in getting more information concerning events about which they were aware. The statements endorsed by newsmagazine non-readers were

more or less non-motives that indicated this latter group likely would use newsmagazines only as a diversion if alternatives were not available.

This discriminant analysis for newsmagazine readership also was strong statistically. The solution was significant at the 0.01 level, and the level of correct categorization was 75.2%. Again prediction was higher than the 49.2% level achieved with Sample I and the 33.3% expected by chance, but far from the 100.0% that a perfect predictor would produce.

Table 6

Table 6 shows the Sample II discriminant solution for the application of the selected uses-and-gratifications statements from Table 3 to readership of consumer magazines. In Table 6, subscribers (-0.11) were related to the Diversion statement of "Improve the quality of my lifestyle" (-0.84); while single copy readers (+0.02) and non-readers (+0.17) were more strongly oriented toward the Surveillance of their local community (+0.96). These relations were supported through examination of the means but reached only the 0.10 level of statistical significance. Testing the equations resulted in correct classifications of 48.4%, greater than the 20.0% level expected by chance, but not markedly higher than the 42.7% level produced by Sample I's descriptive solution. Overall, Table 6's findings meant that consumer magazine subscribers felt those magazines contributed to their lifestyles while occasional readers and non-readers were more oriented to information about their local community.

Hypotheses. Since the factor analyses presented in Table 1 supported the tripartite distinction among Surveillance, Diversion, and Interaction, Hypothesis 1 was accepted with the reservation that although all three dimensions were present, they were composed of different statement relations than were the groupings that emerged from newspaper readership research. This fundamental difference was reinforced by a chronic lack of support for the remaining five hypotheses that were developed by parallelling magazine readership with newspaper readership under the general rubric of print media.

Hypothesis 2's assertion that subscription would be related to Diversion was supported, but the support came from the Diversion statement of improving lifestyle for magazine in general and consumer magazines in particular. Newsmagazine subscription did not reflect the concept of Diversion at all. Consequently, Hypothesis 2 could only be partly accepted at best under the notion that subscription was related to Diversion but that the Diversion was more related to expanding upon or improving lifestyle rather than on a generalized sense of well-being.

Hypothesis 3's assertion that single copy readers and non-readers would view magazines in terms of the Diversion of just passing time simply was not supported. The statement of just passing time did not reach statistical acceptability for all magazines, newsmagazines, or consumer magazines. The only Diversion statement that survived statistically was finding products through advertisements for non-readers of newsmagazines, and that statement was more of a non-reason than a conceptually meaningful explanation.

Further, no support emerged for Hypothesis 4's assertion that subscription and single copy readership would be related to timely knowledge of major events. This notion of timeliness was clearly appropriate for newspaper, but the respondents recognized a different dimensionality for magazines and the statement's applicability to magazine did not survive inferential testing.

Hypothesis 5's assertion that single copy readership would be related to the Interaction of finding stories to tell others was not supported. Instead the Interaction of getting information to pass on to others emerged as important to reading magazines in general and to the non-readers of newsmagazines. Again, the main contribution of these findings was to further assert that magazine was viewed differently than newspaper and that each required independent analysis.

Finally, Hypothesis 6's assertion that non-readers would use magazines to investigate occasional events of interest and to simply kill time was not supported. The Diversion notion of passing time simply was not supported for magazine, and the Surveillance notion of getting more news on witnessed events applied strongly only to the

subscribers of newsmagazines. As before, the data supported the notion of magazine's difference from newspaper in terms of audience orientations toward the two media.

Discussion

Although magazine did produce the expected tripartite distinction among Surveillance, Diversion, and Interaction, it defined those dimensions differently from newspaper. This distinction carried over into explanations of magazine subscription, single copy reading, and non-reading for the magazine medium, newsmagazines, and consumer magazines.

Specifically, improving lifestyle was the strongest explanation for readership among Sample II's 86.3% who reported reading any magazines and the 50.5% of that sample who subscribed to consumer magazines. The second strongest magazine explanation was getting information to pass on to other people, which was related to the 86.3% who read any magazines and to the 75.4% who did not read newsmagazines. The third strong explanation was keeping informed about the local community, which was related to the 13.7% who reported that they had not read a magazine during the previous month and the 28.2% who did not read consumer magazines. Taken together, these three groups of explanations meant that magazine readership was based on the diversionary notion of improving lifestyle and the interactive notion of getting information to pass on, while non-readership was based more on the surveillance orientation of monitoring local events.

This orientation was more characteristic of the widely used consumer magazines (50.5% of Sample II were subscribers) than it was of the more narrowly used newsmagazines (24.6% read or subscribed). Newsmagazine readership was more strongly related to the interactive notion of understanding what is going on, with newsmagazine subscription also strongly related to the surveillance notion of more information on witnessed events.

At the minimum, the study demonstrated that magazine was distinct from newspaper in terms of orientations toward the media and that the uses-and-gratifications concepts of Surveillance, Diversion, and Interaction could be applied to magazine as well as newspaper.

Additionally, the study has identified the notions of improving lifestyle and passing on information as important to magazine readership in general and consumer magazine readership in particular. Further, newsmagazine readership was identifed with understanding what is going on and newsmagazine subscription with more information on witnessed events. By far, the study's greatest handicap was the necessity of using newspaper uses-and-gratifications statements as a starting point because of the paucity of studies on magazine uses-and-gratifications. Future studies need to improve on the statments used to explain magazine readership by making them more directly applicable to magazine medium itself. The relative success of this initial attempt bodes well for future attempts in this area.

-end-

## Footnotes

[1] Elihu Katz and David Foulkes, "On the Use of Mass Media as 'Escape': the Clarification of a Concept," Public Opinion Quarterly 26: 377-388 (1962).

[2] Wayne M. Towers, "Weekday and Sunday Readership Seen Through Uses and Gratifications," Newspaper Research Journal (in press).

[3] Philip Palmgreen, "Uses and Gratifications: A Theoretical Perspective, pp. 20-55 in Communication Yearbook 8. Edited by Robert N. Bostrom with Bruce H. Westley. (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1984), p. 24.

[4] Jay G. Blumler, "The Role of Theory in Uses-and-Gratifications Research," Communication Research 6: 9-36 (1979).

[5] Houghton-Larsen, Rick. "Patterns of Media Use Related to Gratifications Sought." Canadian Journal of Communication 8: 42-55 (1982).

[6] Allen Lichtenstein and Lawrence Rosenfeld, "Uses and Misuses of Gratifications Research," Communication Research 10: 97-109 (1983).

[7] Allen Lichtenstein and Lawrence Rosenfeld, "Normative Expectations and Individual Decisions Concerning Media Gratification Choices," Communication Research 11: 393-414 (1984).

[8] Blumler, "The Role of Theory in Uses-and-Gratifications Studies," op. cit.

[9] Towers, "Weekday and Sunday Readership Seen Through Uses and Gratifications," op. cit.

[10] Towers, Ibid.

[11] Harry H. Harman, Modern Factor Analysis, Second Edition. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967), pp.21-23; 136-143.

[12] William R. Klecka, "Discriminant Analysis," pp. 434-467 in SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, edited by Norman Nie et al. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975).

[13] Paul Vincent Warwick, "Canonical Correlation Analysis: Subprogram Cancorr," pp. 515-527 in SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, edited by Norman Nie et al. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975).

#

Table 1

Factor Analysis of Uses and Gratifications Statements Applied to the Magazine Medium: First Sample (I)

| | Factor(s): I | II | III | Communality: (Estimated) | (Calculated) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Interaction grouping:** | | | | | |
| Get information to pass on to other people (I) | <u>0.74</u> | 0.23 | 0.13 | (0.45) | (0.61) |
| Find interesting or unusual stories that I can tell to others (I) | <u>0.59</u> | 0.29 | 0.17 | (0.41) | (0.47) |
| Understand what is going On (S) | <u>0.50</u> | 0.17 | 0.45 | (0.42) | (0.48) |
| Find issues affecting people like myself (S) | <u>0.50</u> | 0.21 | 0.30 | (0.36) | (0.38) |
| **Diversion grouping:** | | | | | |
| By being my friend when I am alone (D) | 0.16 | <u>0.63</u> | 0.09 | (0.34) | (0.43) |
| Be happy (D) | 0.11 | <u>0.59</u> | 0.14 | (0.33) | (0.38) |
| Just pass the time (D) | 0.11 | <u>0.59</u> | -0.04 | (0.30) | (0.36) |
| Be entertained (D) | 0.35 | <u>0.51</u> | 0.02 | (0.36) | (0.38) |
| Find products through advertisements (U) | 0.25 | <u>0.39</u> | 0.15 | (0.23) | (0.24) |
| Improve the quality of my lifestyle (I) | 0.27 | <u>0.36</u> | 0.27 | (0.28) | (0.28) |
| **Surveillance grouping:** | | | | | |
| Get immediate knowledge of big news events (S) | 0.11 | -0.08 | <u>0.68</u> | (0.32) | (0.48) |
| Keep me informed about what is happening in my local community (S) | 0.07 | 0.11 | <u>0.60</u> | (0.27) | (0.38) |
| Get exciting, dramatic and entertaining news (U) | 0.38 | 0.22 | <u>0.50</u> | (0.41) | (0.44) |
| Get more information on things I have seen such as movies, sports events or accidents (U) | 0.31 | 0.14 | <u>0.44</u> | (0.30) | (0.31) |
| Eigenvalue(s): | 4.6 | 1.7 | 1.0 | | |
| Percent of variance: | 32.6% | 12.4% | 7.5% | | |
| Cumulative percent: | 32.6% | 45.0% | 52.5% | | |

<u>KEY</u>:

(S) = Surveillance (D) = Diversion
(I) = Interaction (U) = Unique

Table 2

Factor Analysis of Uses and Gratifications Statements Applied to the Magazine Medium: Second Sample (II)

| | Factor(s): I | II | III | Communality: (Estimated) | (Calculated) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Interaction grouping: | | | | | |
| Get information to pass on to other people (I) | 0.76 | 0.16 | 0.11 | (0.61) | (0.61) |
| Find interesting or unusual stories that I can tell to others (I) | 0.65 | 0.31 | 0.05 | (0.48) | (0.52) |
| Understand what is going On (I) | 0.57 | 0.17 | 0.33 | (0.48) | (0.46) |
| Find issues affecting people like myself (I) | 0.54 | 0.20 | 0.27 | (0.38) | (0.40) |
| Diversion grouping: | | | | | |
| Be happy (D) | 0.07 | 0.65 | 0.13 | (0.38) | (0.45) |
| By being my friend when I am alone (D) | 0.01 | 0.62 | 0.09 | (0.43) | (0.40) |
| Be entertained (D) | 0.34 | 0.61 | -0.05 | (0.38) | (0.49) |
| Just pass the time (D) | 0.31 | 0.53 | -0.03 | (0.36) | (0.38) |
| Improve the quality of my lifestyle (D) | 0.32 | 0.46 | 0.14 | (0.28) | (0.33) |
| Find products through advertisements (D) | 0.25 | 0.37 | 0.03 | (0.24) | (0.20) |
| Surveillance grouping: | | | | | |
| Get immediate knowledge of big news events (S) | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.68 | (0.48) | (0.47) |
| Keep me informed about what is happening in my local community (S) | -0.04 | 0.01 | 0.68 | (0.38) | (0.39) |
| Get exciting, dramatic and entertaining news (S) | 0.29 | 0.13 | 0.59 | (0.44) | (0.45) |
| Get more information on things I have seen such as movies, sports events or accidents (S) | 0.22 | 0.06 | 0.46 | (0.31) | (0.27) |
| Eigenvalue(s): | 4.3 | 2.0 | 1.3 | | |
| Percent of variance: | 30.6% | 14.0% | 9.2% | | |
| Cumulative percent: | 30.6% | 44.6% | 53.9% | | |

KEY:

(S) = Surveillance (D) = Diversion
(I) = Interaction

Table 3

Summary of Discriminant Variables

for Magazine Reading: First Sample (I)

| INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: | All Magazines | News-Magazines | Consumer Magazines |
|---|---|---|---|
| Groups: (Read any) | -0.16 | ----- | ----- |
| Subscribe | ------ | -0.44 | +0.28 |
| Single copies | ----- | -0.77 | +0.11 |
| Don't read | +0.71 | +0.20 | -0.47 |
| DEPENDENT VARIABLES: | | | |
| (Rank orderings in parentheses or brackets): | | | |
| Understand what is going on (I) | -0.45(1) | -0.23(5) | +0.34(2) |
| Get information to pass on to other people (I) | -0.42(2) | -0.35(3) | +0.28(4) |
| Be entertained (D) | -0.40(3) | ----- | ----- |
| Improve the quality of my lifestyle (D) | -0.29(4) | ----- | +0.35(1) |
| Find issues affecting people like myself (S) | -0.18(5) | ----- | +0.33(3) |
| Get more information on things I've seen such as movies, sports events or accidents (I) | ----- | -0.49(1) | -0.26[3] |
| Get immediate knowledge of big news events (S) | ----- | -0.36(2) | -0.27[2] |
| Get exciting, dramatic and entertaining news (S) | ----- | -0.33(4) | -0.24[4] |
| Be happy (D) | ----- | +0.13[4] | +0.26(5) |
| Find products through advertisements (D) | ----- | +0.43[2] | +0.25(6) |
| Just pass the time (D) | ----- | ------ | +0.19(7) |
| Keep me informed about what is happening in my local community (S) | +0.34[2] | +0.56[1] | -0.33[1] |
| By being my friend when I am alone (D) | +0.38[1] | +0.40[3] | -0.10[5] |
| Eigenvalue(s): | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.04 |
| Canonical correlation: | 0.32 | 0.33 | 0.31 |
| Wilks' lambda: | 0.90 | 0.97 | 0.84 |
| Chi-square goodness-of-fit: (degrees of freedom) | 57.2(7) | 14.2(8) | 72.1(24) |
| p < | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.01 |
| Correctly classified: | 71.4% | 49.2% | 42.7% |
| (Prior probability): | (50.0%) | (33.3%) | (33.3%) |

KEY: (D) = Diversion; (S) = Surveillance; (I) = Interaction

Table 4

Mean Replies to Key Uses and Gratifications Statements for Read Magazines: Sample II

| | DEPENDENT VARIABLE: Magazine Readership: Read any | Do not read |
|---|---|---|
| (Canonical correlation loadings in parentheses): | (+0.08) | (-0.48) |
| INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: | | |
| Improve the quality of my lifestyle (D) (+0.52) | <u>3.55</u> | 3.07 |
| Find issues affecting people like myself (I) (+0.46) | <u>3.63</u> | 3.17 |
| Get information to pass on to other people (I) (+0.37) | <u>3.76</u> | 3.33 |
| Keep me informed about what is happening in my local community (S) (-0.66) | 2.65 | <u>2.73</u> |
| Expected percents (Sample I): | 81.9% | 18.1% |
| Measured percents (Sample II): (N = 556) | 86.3% | 13.7% |

Eigenvalue = 0.04; canonical correlation = 0.19

Wilks' lambda =0.96; Chi-square goodness-of-fit =19.8; df =4; $p \leq 0.01$

Percent correctly classified = 86.2% (Sample I = 71.4%)

<u>KEY</u>:
(D) = Diversion; (S) = Surveillance; (I) = Interaction

Table 5

Mean Replies to Key Uses and Gratifications Statements for Read Newsmagazine: Sample II

| | DEPENDENT VARIABLE: Newsmagazine Readership: Sub-scribe | Single copy | Do not read |
|---|---|---|---|
| (Canonical correlation loadings in parentheses): | (+0.39) | (+0.26) | (-0.11) |
| INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: | | | |
| Understand what is going On (I) (+1.07) | 3.83 | 3.67 | 3.50 |
| Get more information on things I have seen such as movies, sports events or accidents (S) (+0.24) | 3.50 | 3.09 | 3.24 |
| Find products through advertisements (D) (-0.90) | 3.45 | 3.31 | 3.67 |
| Get information to pass on to other people (I) (-0.37) | 3.69 | 3.73 | 3.70 |
| Expected percents (Sample I): | 16.8% | 9.6% | 73.6% |
| Measured percents (Sample II): (N = 557) | 16.5% | 8.1% | 75.4% |

Eigenvalue = 0.04; canonical correlation = 0.20

Wilks' lambda =0.95; Chi-square goodness-of-fit =26.1; df =8; $p \leq 0.01$

Percent correctly classified = 75.2% (Sample I = 49.2%)

KEY:
(D) = Diversion; (S) = Surveillance; (I) = Interaction

Table 6

Mean Replies to Key Uses and Gratifications Statements for Read Consumer Magazine: Sample II

| | DEPENDENT VARIABLE: Consumer Magazine Readership: Sub-scribe | Single copy | Do not read |
|---|---|---|---|
| (Canonical correlation loadings in parentheses): | (-0.11) | (+0.02) | (+0.17) |
| INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: | | | |
| Improve the quality of my lifestyle (D) (-0.84) | 3.56 | 3.46 | 3.39 |
| Keep me informed about what is happening in my local community (S) (+0.96) | 2.58 | 2.67 | 2.82 |
| Expected percents (Sample I): | 44.9% | 23.0% | 32.1% |
| Measured percents (Sample II): (N = 556) | 50.5% | 21.2% | 28.2% |

Eigenvalue = 0.01; canonical correlation = 0.12

Wilks' lambda =0.99; Chi-square goodness-of-fit =7.9; df =4; $p \leq 0.10$

Percent correctly classified = 48.4% (Sample I = 42.7%)

KEY:
(D) = Diversion; (S) = Surveillance; (I) = Interaction